

REMARKS

Claims 18-26, 28-30, 36 and 38 are pending. Claims 1-17, 27, 31-35 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 24-25 have been amended to correct minor formal informalities. Claim 38, which is identical to original claim 27, have been added. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

1. Claim objections

Claim 20 has been objected to as being improper dependent form. The Applicants respectfully traverse these objections. Claim 18 recites a pixel electrode formed on the first passivation layer (accordingly, the Applicants asserts that the Examiner incorrectly stated that claim 18 recites a pixel electrode formed on the reflective layer) while claim 20 recites the reflective layer formed on the pixel electrode. Thus the two structures as recited in claims 18 and 20 are different and claim 20 is a proper dependent claim from base claim 18. Accordingly, the objections to claim 20 have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 24-25 have been objected to because of formal informalities. In this amendment, claims 24-25 have been amended to depend from claim 19 rather than from claim 18. Accordingly, the objections to claims 24-25 have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

2. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 18, 21, 23, 27-30 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Murai et al. ("Murai") US 2005/0213005. Claims 19, 22, 24-26 and

36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Murai. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on the following arguments.

Murai describes a transfective liquid crystal device comprising an interlayer insulating layer 4 made of a silicon oxide film (see paragraph 67, lines 1-2) and an unevenness forming layer 13a made of a first photosensitive resin formed on the upper surface of the interlayer insulating layer 4 with a predetermined pattern (see paragraph 68, lines 1-3). Thus, by Murai, the protrusions (that is, the unevenness forming layer with predetermined patterns) are on a different layer from the passivation layer (that is, the interlayer insulating layer). Moreover, the unevenness layer in Murai is not at least in part due to a protrusion on the passivation layer. Further, the color filters 24 or 241 as described in Murai are integrally formed in both the reflection display region 100b and the transmission display region 100b (see paragraph 78, lines 6-10; paragraph 91, lines 5-11; and Figures 4-17). That is, there is no through hole in the reflective portion.

In contrast, amended claim 18 recites a fabricating method of a transfective liquid crystal display device comprising forming a first passivation layer on the thin film transistor, the first passivation layer having at least one protrusion in the reflective portion, forming an uneven reflective layer on the first passivation layer in the reflective portion that has unevenness at least in part due to the at least one protrusion, and providing a second substrate having a color filter layer, each color filter of the color filter layer having at least one through hole in the reflective portion. Support for the amended claim 18 can be found in the Applicants' specification, for example, in paragraph 2, lines 1-2 and in paragraph 46, lines 5-6.


In view of the amended claim 18 and the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections against amended claim 18, and thus against dependent claims 19-26, 28-30, 36 and 38, which all depend from independent claim 18, have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

3. Conclusion

Based on the above remarks/arguments, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 28, 2006



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200